

The following is the last full paragraph on page 2 of the Appeal Brief filed November 6, 2006:

Referring to Figure 2 and independent claims 6 and 10, a remote procedure call (RPC) processing method in a multi-protocol object distribution system is disclosed. In step 202, a communicative link is established with the distributed object using a default RPC transport mechanism (page 9, lines 1-3 of Applicants' disclosure). In step 204, the distributed object is then queried over the communicative link for other RPC transport mechanisms which are supported by the server (page 9, lines 7-9). In step 208, one of the other RPC transport mechanisms is selected (page 9, lines 10-12), and in step 210 the communicative link is re-established with the distributed object using the selected RPC transport mechanism (page 9, lines 12-13). In step 216, the RPC request for services from the distributed object over the re-established communicative link is processed (page 9, lines 19-20).

As evident from the above paragraph, reference to Appellants' disclosure, both by page and line number and by drawings has been performed. This paragraph refers to both independent claims 6 and 10 since, as evident from the below table, the steps recited in both claims 6 and 10 are identical.

Steps of claim 6	Steps of claim 10
receiving an RPC request for services from a distributed object in a server in the multi-protocol object distribution system	receiving an RPC request for services from a distributed object in a server in the multi-protocol object distribution system
establishing a communicative link with said distributed object using a default RPC transport mechanism, and querying said distributed object over said communicative link for other RPC transport mechanisms which are supported by said server	establishing a communicative link with said distributed object using a default RPC transport mechanism, and querying said distributed object over said communicative link for other RPC transport mechanisms which are supported by said server
selecting one said other RPC transport mechanisms and re-establishing said communicative link with said distributed object using said selected RPC transport mechanism	selecting one said other RPC transport mechanisms and re-establishing said communicative link with said distributed object using said selected RPC transport mechanism
processing said RPC request for services from said distributed object over said re-established communicative link	processing said RPC request for services from said distributed object over said re-established communicative link

Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that the each of independent claims 6 and 10 has been properly summarized.

The following is the paragraph spanning pages 2 and 3 of the Appeal Brief filed November 6, 2006:

Referring to Figure 1 and independent claim 1, a multi-protocol object distribution system is disclosed. The system includes a plurality of remote procedure call (RPC) transport protocol stubs 106, 108, 110, and a meta-stub 104 (page 7, line 22 through page 8, line 1). The meta stub 104 is configured to establish a communicative link with a distributed object 118 using a default RPC transport stub (page 9, lines 1-3). The meta stub 104 also selects individual ones of the RPC transport protocol stubs 106, 108, 110 through which distributed object services 118 can be provided to requesting clients 100 in the object distribution system (page 8, lines 18-21). The meta stub 104 further reestablishes the communicative link using the selected individual one of the RPC protocol stubs 106, 108, 110 (page 9, lines 12-13).

As evident from the above paragraph, reference to Appellants' disclosure, both by page and line number and by drawings has been performed with regard to independent claim 1. Therefore, the subject matter of each of independent claims 1, 6, and 10 has been concisely explained, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v).

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17, 41.20, and in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: March 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320